App. F. IX-4.

1927-D

File No. 100-27

Previous References (Genl

Serial Nos. 1-15

Later References

Preserve

(87)

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. 3 & 4. Ker

Part B for Nov. 28

SUBJECT Explosives

Amendment to Mysore Arms Rules of 1918 1926

Unbleached

G. R. S. III—11 1927 - 8

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Genl

NOTES.

Genl 1000-27

File No. 495-1

FILE HEADING.

Amendment to the Burma Explosives Rules 1908

From

The District Magistrate, Shwebo

No.	Dated	Received
269/26-27	25/4/27	27/4/27

Diary No.	Enclos.	Spare Copies.	Serial No.
6910 P 26			

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Proposes change in rule 62 of the Explosive Rules so as to correspond with ruling of the Burma arms rules 1926 and the alternative seeking clear instructions on the matter

NOTES AND ORDERS.

1) The Distt Magistrate states that in the Revised Arms rules of 1926, the proviso that existed under rule 13 of the old rules has been omitted but no corresponding change has been made in rule 62 of the Explosive Rules with the result that the said fees under the Explosive Rules & the Revised Arms Rules being Rs 2/8 &

NOTES—First Sheet.

WD 1551—GPB—30,000—1-8-21

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 195 of 1926

Serial No.

respectively & the ~~copies~~ license under the explosive rules can now be made to have effect as like license under the Explosive Substances Act, Arms rules of the Govt. should observe 2/8- per each license to be endorsed and obtain clear instructions in the matter.

2) Rule 92 of the explosive rules stipulates as follows:—

"Any authority granting a license under these rules may, if such authority thinks fit, direct by an order written on the license that it shall have the effect of a like license granted by the like authority under the Explosive Substances Act."

Validity of license under Arms Act.

3) In the old arms rules, the following proviso finds a place:—

Rule 130 of

"Notwithstanding anything contained in this rule, a person holding a license under the Explosive Substances Act, 1908 endorsed in accordance with Rule 42 of the rules thereunder, to manufacture possess and sell explosives may be granted free of all charge a license for the same period in Form II or Form III respectively, in regard to ammunition

NOTE—Contn. sheet

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 195 of 1926

Serial No.

or military stores which are explosives.

4) The above proviso has been omitted with revised term under Rule 26.

5) Gone the fees charged for ~~possession~~ obtaining and sell under the Explosives Rules are as follows:—

(1) Covering the maximum quantity of explosives (2 volts) allowed or any less quantity exceeding one half such maximum ——— 10—0—0

(2) Covering half such maximum or any less quantity exceeding one-fourth ——— 5—0—0

(3) Covering one fourth such maximum (2 volts) or any less quantity — 2—8—0

The fees chargeable for a similar licence under Rule 4 (Form IV ——— 10—0—0

6) Thus if the explosive licence is endorsed as directed in Rule 29 the Explosives rules part. should be Rs 7/8- as the explosive licence fee only Rs 2/8- for possessing 5 volts at a time. ~~Gone~~ the existing decree

NOTE—Contn. sheet

GPB—5,700—30-3-27

4910

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 195 of 1926.

Serial No.

penury would naturally induce every man who in the ordinary course will have to take a license in form IV of the revised Arms Rules of 1926, to obtain an explosive license for his gun and obtain an endorsement under rule 52 of the explosive rules for a free license in form IV. The Govt of Baluchistan solicits clear instructions in the matter.

7) Correspondence. 8) The remedy seems to lie either in enhancing the fee in the case of explosive license to Rs 10/- or in abrogating Rule 52 of the Explosive Rules altogether. The Development Branch may be consulted.

* for possessing 50 lbs.

Asst 2/5

9) Please find out what the provisions of the Rules in this matter are under the Rules (Explosives) in Br. India are.

S/5

10) This may be referred to the Development Branch for putting up the Explosive Rules for India.

7/5/27.

11) To the Deputy for kind compliance

7/5

7465

DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

7 MAY 1927

GEN. & REV. SECRETARY.

NOTE—Contn. sheet

GPB—5,000—30-3-27

P. 4910.

7465

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 195 of 1926

Serial No.

12) Spare copies of Explosives Rules of Pr. Indies are not available in the Dev. Pr. Libry. G.R.S. may however be consulted

13) Secl. 69-15 containing a copy of Pr. India rules is put up for speedy & may kindly be returned early

MD 25/5/27

Pers. Pr)

Pol Dept 27.5.27

14) Under rule 63 chapter VII of the Indian explosive rules, the licence can be made to have effect for like licence under the Indian arms act of 1878. The fees charged for licence to possess and sell under the Indian Explosive rules are the same as those in force in Imperial under the Imperial explosive rules. The fees chargable under the Indian Arms Rules & the Imperial Arms Rules 1926 are also similar being Rs 10/- in each case

MD 31/5/27

15) The Indian Rules put up are the Rules of 1914, and it is not known if they have not been altered after the issue of the Indian Arms Rules 1924. A reference to the latest Explosive

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

A1 F. III—2]

in 71d CRO 51

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 195 of 1926.

Serial No.

Rules obtaining in Br India seems necessary
Also if a similar difficulty has been felt
there & if so how it has been solved

16) A copy of the latest Br Indian
A) Rules may perhaps be obtained from the
Chief Inspector of Mines or an enquiry
B) in the matter made of that Officer

APR 4/6

17) A+B may both be done

K 6/6

APR 5/6

18) Draft letter prepared.

APR 17/6

19) Sent 25/3/26

2 To the Chief Inspector of Mines
Rep 6435 dt 18.6.25.
Calls for some information.

Letter No 84 dated 15th January 1927 from
the Chief Inspector of Mines in Myore
20) Forwarding the letter it will be
seen that action is being taken by the
Chief Inspector to bring the above
anomaly by proposing an amend-
ment to the Explosive Rules in consultation
with the Dist Magistrates. The remaining

This not clear if he wants Govt to pass orders on this reply alone for Amending the Explosives Rules also

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 2293—GPB—10,000—4-5-27

P 368 D 7465

Serial No.

action taken by him may perhaps be communicated. 21) The Devt Dr may perhaps be asked to state if any reps has been recd there from Chief Insp of Mines proposing the amendment of the Explosive Rules; vide para 3 of his letter

DEVELT

dec Br) 28/7/27

22) No reps. on the subject has been recd in the Dev. Dept. Let Cordy

28/7/27

26-7-27

Post Br)

23) Submitted. Disconnected The Chief Insp apparently wants Govt to express views re his proposal to amend the Explosives Rules 1926 contained in Para 4 of his letter. It is stated there that the Director of Industries & Supply have not furnished their opinion on the proposal. The Chief Insp may perhaps be requested to get their opinion also & send up his proposal in a final form for the orders of Govt

29/7 24) The Chief Inspector of mines may be requested to send the copy letters of the D.I.'s & to obtain & send the opinions of the D.I.'s of

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 2293—GPB—10,000—4-5-27

General and Revenue Secretariat. File No. 195 of 1926.

Serial No.

Number of Ryotsare before the question of amending the Rule is decided

3rd member) 28/8

25) all right 28/8

4/8

4.8

25/8 4.8

27/8

4/8/27 Draft put up.

5/8/27 Approved

27) Issued

6/8

4 To the Chief Inspector of Mines

Rop 870 of 10.8.27

Requests to send the letters received from the Mines so far & also obtain & forward the opinions of the Mines of Tumkur & Mysore in the matter

Letter No. 226 dated 11th August 1927 from the Chief Inspector of Mines in Mysore

28) Forwards letters received from the Mines of Kolar, Hassan, Kadur, Chitaldrug & Bangalore. & says he has written to the Deputies of Ryotsare & Tumkur but no replies from the Mines of Mysore & Hassan Mysore are awaited

29) Yes

17/8

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

17/8/27

AVD 0321-GPB-60,000-24-5-27

16/8

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 195 of 1926.

Serial No.

Letter No 298 dated 22nd August 1927 from the Chief Inspector of Mines.

30) Submits 5 copies of Mysore Gold Mines letter forwarding his views on the proposed amendments to the Mysore Mines Rules

31) Reports the Ore Smelter may be availed. 25/8/27.

32) Yes 27/8

33) Send with a draft as the report has not yet been received 29/8

34) Done 30/10

Issued 1122 / 1/11/27

Letter No 7169 of 27/8/27 from the Chief Inspector of Mines, stating that a copy has not been received from the Ore Smelter, yet & that an urgent reminder has been sent to him

35) Further report of the Inspecting Mines may be awaited 5/11/27

36) Yes 6/11

37) Further report from the Chief Inspector of Mines has not been recd.

Send with a reminder 8/12

38) Issue 8/12

No. P 3062 of 8/12/27

NOTE.—Contn. sheet

Cw 4

WD 0324—GPB—80,000—21-5-27

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 195 of 1926.

Serial No.

Letter No 1133 dated 4th January 1928 from the Chief Inspector of mines forwarding copy of Inspector Mines. 39) All the Dists except the Dist Inspector who has expressed no opinion are for amending the explosives rules by adding a proviso on the lines suggested by the Chief Inspector of Mines. The Dist Magistrate, on the other hand suggests the waiving of the license fees both of- under the Explosives rules rather than add a proviso to the Arms rules of 1926.

A

ml 40) 57/28. The opinion of the Dist Magistrate is qualified.

H

He wants the license under the Explosives Rules to have paid unless procured under the Arms Rules.; if he wants a license under the latter pays charge.

Subordinates.

7/1

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 0321 -GPB—60,000—21 5-27

A. 22]
E].
E. C.

SUBJECT.

File No 195 of 1926.

Serial No

41) The District Magistrate of Shimoga points out that the proviso to rule 13 of the old Arms Rules has been omitted and does not find a place in the new Arms Rules and that, if an explosives license is endorsed as directed in rule 52 of the Explosives Rules, Government would lose a certain portion of the fee leviable under the Arms Rules, and has therefore sought for the instructions of the Government.

42) The Chief Inspector of Mines, who was referred to in the matter, has called for the opinions of the District Magistrates on the point and sent his views in his letter dated 15th July 1927 suggesting that a clause similar to sub para of rule 13 of the Mysore Arms Rules of 1917 may be added to the new rules of 1926 with the proviso that a licensee under the Explosives Rules, who applies for the endorsement of his license under rule 52 thereof, shall have paid the amount of fee prescribed under the Arms Rules for the license, which he claims free of charge.

43) In this connection, the various provisions of law relating to this point have to be taken into consideration. Under the proviso to section 13 of the Mysore Explosives Regulation, "an authority granting a license under this Regulation for the manufacture, possession, sale, transport, or importation of an explosive may, if empowered in this behalf by the rules under which the license is granted, direct by an order ~~in~~ written on the license that it shall have the effect of a like license granted under the said Indian Arms Act." Rule 52 of the Mysore Explosives

Contn. Sheets,

WD 01263—GPB—750—30-12-25

Rules

A. 23]
L. C.
E. C.

SUBJECT.

File No 195 of 1926

Serial No

Rules provides that "any authority granting a license under these rules may, if such authority thinks fit, direct by an order written on the license that it shall have the effect of a like license granted by the like authority under the Mysore Arms Regulation of 1890" Under item (3) of Schedule I to the Mysore Explosives Rules, the rates of fees for licenses to manufacture, possess and sell, and to possess and sell arms are provided for. In the sixth column of the Schedule, it is stated that where the applicant holds and produces a license in Forms II and III of the forms prescribed under the Mysore Arms Rules of 1905, such license shall be issued free of charge.

(Page 38)

44) So far with regard to the Explosives Regulation and the Rules. The Indian Explosives Rules also contain similar provisions. (Please see Rule 63 of the Indian Explosives Rules put up, and items 4 and 5 of Schedule II.)

(Page 28, Flag C.

45) Under rule 13 of the old Arms Rules, the proviso was to the following effect:-

"Notwithstanding anything contained in this rule, a person holding license under the Mysore Explosives Regulation II of 1888, endorsed in accordance with rule 52 of the Rules thereunder to manufacture, possess or sell or to possess and sell explosives may be granted, free of all charge, a license for the same period in Form II or Form III respectively, in regard to ammunition or military stores which are not explosives." This rule has not been embodied in the new Arms Rules of 1926.

Contn. Sheets,

WD 01263—GPB—750—30-12-25

, A. 22]
E. C.
E. C.

SUBJECT.

Pol File No 195 of 1926.

Serial No

46) The effect of this proviso to rule 13 of the old Rules was that an endorsement made by the licensing authority under rule 52 of the Explosives Rules and the license issued by him would enable the licensee to ask for a license, free of all charge, under the Arms Rules in Form II or Form III. It did not in any way affect the question of the fees to be collected. The absence of such a proviso in the new rules does not at all affect the question of fees to be levied for the license. In fact, the proviso was unnecessary even under the old rules, for, under rule 52 of the Explosives Rules, it was stated that the writing of the licensing authority should have the effect of a like license granted by the like authority under the Mysore Arms Regulation of 1890, which would mean that a separate license was perhaps not necessary under the Arms Rules.

47) The ~~other~~ point to be considered, then, is whether any step has to be taken for the anomaly pointed out by the District Magistrate of Shimoga. He, as also the Inspector of Mines, points out that it is only when explosives licensees who have paid only Rs.5 or Rs.2/8 as fee for their licenses claim~~ed~~ free endorsement under rule 52, that the question of the reconciliation of fees under the two Rules arises.

48) Now, it is no doubt true that under rule 52 it is left to the discretion of the District Magistrate to endorse or not the license under rule 52 of the Explosives Rules. It is possible that a person wh

Contn. Sheets,

WD 01263—GPB—750—30-12-25

3291

A. 22J
E. C.
E. C.

SUBJECT.

Pol File No 195 of 1926

Serial No

he has taken out a license paying a fee of Rs.5 or Rs.2/8 under the Explosive Rules may ask for an endorsement under rule 52 of the Explosives Rules and get the privileges of a licensee in Form II or Form III under the Arms Rules. Whether this anomaly is to be rectified is for consideration. It may however be pointed out that the same anomaly existed even under the old rules, and no steps were taken for getting over it. A similar anomaly exists even in the British Indian Arms and Explosives Rules, and no steps seem to have been taken by the Government of India for rectifying it. If it is considered necessary to rectify it, a rule like the one suggested by the Inspector of Mines in his letter dated 15th July 1927 may perhaps be made in the Mysore Explosives Rules, rather than in the Mysore Arms Rules, since the fees for license under the Arms Rules are fixed and there is no provision like the one under rule 52 of the Mysore Explosives Rules, in the Arms Rules.

4g/ The Development Branch may be consulted.

Leg d-D) 16/1

5a) 17-1.

Dev Br) 17.1

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT
D. 5906
17 JAN. 1928
DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

Contn. Sheets,

WD 01263—GPB—750—30-12-25

(1 S-7)

D 5906

15

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. — File No. 195 of 1927.

Serial No.

S1) Please put up a copy each of the following

1) Arms Regulation
2) Rules under do — (old edition)
+ 3) (revised)

for perusal; without which it will not be possible to furnish any opinion

26/1/28

Secy: Rev:

S2) Arms Regulation and the Amendments Rules are put up.

26/1/28 To the Dist Br

JEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT
27 JAN. 1928
DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

S3) Asked vide a copy each of Arms Regn: & Rules thereunder (old & new), Explosives Regn: & Rules thereunder

S4) The Chief Inspr: of Mines in his letter dt (5-7-27) suggests the an amendment to the Arms Rules of 1926, and the Law Secy: wants that a rule may be framed & included in the Explosives Rules (page 14 - para 48 Concluding portion)

In case it is considered necessary

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat. Pol File No. 195 of 1926.

Serial No.

to obtain the opinion of the Ch Inspr on this point a reference has to be made

55) for orders
287/28

56) The Ch Inspr of Explosives may be consulted
Secy D)

30/1

30/28

30/1

57) Draft rules
20
31.1.28

58) Issue
1/2/28

To

Pol 1. The offg: ch: Inspr of mines.
No. D 8144/Pol 100-27-1 dt 2/2/28.
Enquires whether it wd. not be better to codify rule like the one suggested in his letter No 84 D dt 7/27 to amend Mysl. explosives rules instead of the Arms rules.

2. From the offg: ch: Inspr of mines
No 1417 dt 4/2/28
States that he is of opinion that the Mysore Arms Rules and not the Explosives Rule as it is quite clear is to be amended and suggests an amendment

Secy A

SECRETARIAT 1928 BANGALORE

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

29.28 P. I

6579

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. Genl. File No. 680 of 1927

17

Serial No. 2.

(5a) The Offg: Ch: Inspr is of opinion that Rule 52 of the Mysore Explosives Rules requires no modification in the matter of endorsing an Explosive license for Arms Act purposes, as it is quite clear.

(b) He suggests an amendment clause to the Mys. arms Rules in para 6 of P.U.D

(6) Submitted with reference to para 48, page 14, concluding portion for Hqr. Hqr B2. with compt

61. For favour of further remarks, if any

Hqr

62

Submitted with reference to paras 41 to 49 above.

Hqr

(63) The point raised by the Dt. Magte, Shimoga, has been fully discussed in paras 41 to 49 above.

(64) There is no connection between the omission in the new Arms Rules of the last para. of the old Rule 13 and the loss of a revenue referred to by the Dt. Magte. Before the new Arms Rules came into force the holder of a license granted under the Expl. Rules had two advantages ~~in (a)~~ if the license was endorsed under Rule 52 of those Rules viz. (a) the advantage of the same license having the effect of a like license granted under the Arms Rules

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0324—GPB—60,000—21-5-27

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 100 of 1927

Serial No.

in respect of the explosives to which it applied and (b) the advantage of getting a free license under the ~~paragraph~~ ~~deleted~~ para, now deleted, of the old Arms Rule 13 (f) in regard to ammunition or military stores which are <u>not explosives</u>". The former advantage was derived from Rule 52 of the Expl. Rules and remains unaffected as this Rule remains unchanged. The latter advantage is now lost by such a licensee in consequence of the omission of the last para. of the old Arms Rule 13. The result is that to the holder of an Expl. license, ~~endorsed~~ endorsed under Expl. Rule 52, it is no longer open to a licensing authority under the Arms Rules to grant, on the strength of such endorsement, a free license in respect of <u>non-explosives</u>. It is not clear why this second advantage was allowed to the holder of an Expl. license at all — why the holder of an Expl. license should not be required to take out a separate license in respect of non-explosives, if the Arms Rules apply to

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

[WD 0321—GPB—60,000—24-5-27

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Vol File No. 100 of 1927 | 19

Serial No.

them, in accordance with the new Arms Rules

(5) As regards the license fees, the rates under the two sets of Rules are fixed on different bases. In the case of Expl. licenses ~~the fees are~~ the fees are determined by the rate fixed in Col. 6 of Schedule I of these Rules according to the nature of the respective license and with reference to the ~~maximum~~ quantity of explosives allowed; in the case of licenses under the Arms Rules the fees are fixed ~~with reference to the maximum~~ with reference to the maximum quantity of ammunition or military stores allowed. It seems necessary therefore to examine, with reference to a few concrete cases, the effect of the suggested equalization of fees ~~which~~ which under the two sets of Rules before this suggestion is adopted. If it is decided to adopt the suggestion the most appropriate place for providing for it would be ~~Rules~~ the Expl. Rule 52 as it is an endorsement under that Rules that exempts the licensee from having out a separate license under the Arms Rules and as it is thus

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat. (Gen'l) File No. 100 of 1927. 21

Serial No.

endorsement that is proposed to be restricted to ~~the~~ licenses ~~granted~~ in respect of which the fees leviable under the Arms Rules are paid.

(6) It is ~~explained~~ stated that some District Magistrates have been refusing to grant ~~free~~ licenses under the Arms Rules on the authority of explosives licenses. ~~But~~ It is not clear what exactly is meant or how this ~~explanation~~ is the result of the omission in the new Arms Rules of the last para of the old Arms Rule 13. As already stated above the old rule, now omitted, provided for a free license in such cases only "in regard to ammunition or military stores which are not explosives". A license under the Expl. Rules applies only to explosives - if such a license was endorsed under the Expl. Rule 52 no separate license was required at all ~~in respect of such explosives~~ ~~even if not manufactured~~ when the old Arms Rule in question was in force and none is required even now, as the effect of the endorsement is to ~~exempt~~ exempt the licensee altogether from having out

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 100 of 1927. | 21

Serial No.

a license under the Arms Rules in respect of the same explosives and this exemption is derived solely from the proviso to S. 13 of the Expl. Subs. & the Expl. Rule 52 which continue to be in full force.

6) The file may now be transferred to the Development Secty. for such further action as may be considered necessary

27/4

Secy)

6) I agree

6) Developed with Compts for favour of taking 21.4 further action

23/4

23/4

7) Please bring up.

23 4 28

24/4

11) The difficulty pointed out by the Dist Magistrate of Shimoga is one which has existed ever since [illegible] Rule 13 of the Arms Rules in the new rules [illegible]

and has in no way arisen from the omission of the old proviso to

7) It stands to reason that rule 52 of the Explosives Rules, which is

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 108 of 1927. | 22

Serial No.

intended for the benefit or convenience of the licensee, shd not be capable of being so worked as to result in a losing revenue to Govt. The rule, even as it stands, vests in the administering officer a discretion whether or not to give the Explosives License the effect of an Arms Act License There is nothing to prevent him now from refusing to do so if the conversion would result in a losing revenue, as for instance where the holder of a 2/8 Explosives license shd apply to have it converted by endorsement into a 10 Rs Arms Act license

73) I think the difficulty wd be fully met by an amplification of rule 52 by the addition of the words

"provided that if under the Arms Rules in force a higher fee is leviable on the license, the diffce bet. the fee already paid under the Expl. Rules and that which would be leviable under the Arms Rules

NOTE— Contn. sheet

WD 0321—GPB—60,000—24-5-27

6579 5905 3291

App. E III—27

General and Revenue Secretariat. PoC File No. 495 of 1926

22

Serial No.

shall be recovered before such endorsement is made on the li- cense."

2d Member)

25/4/28

74). I do not see why Separate licenses shd not be taken under the two Laws. Why shd a person holding an Explosives license necessarily require a license under Arms ~~Act~~ Reg ? ~~Arms and Ammunition~~ or Military Stores which are not Explosives shd properly be dealt with under the Arms Regs and it shd make no difference whether an applicant holds a license under the Explosives law or not. On this view the best solution would be to delete Rule 52 of the Explosives Rules. Whether the deletion of this rule and the withdrawal of the advantages afforded by it would cause any real inconvenience is the only point for consideration & for information on this point is not available in the Secretariat, may Committee C.A. of Arms

27/5/28

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0324—GPB—60,000—24-5-27

App. F III

General and Revenue Secretariat. File No. 10 0 of 1927.

Serial No.

75) Please put up a note on A. It would help if we could know in how many cases the Sepl. license has been converted by endorsement into an Arms Act license. The figures may be got from the authorities concerned. Also consult C. P. of Rules, and request Protection Br for a note.

5/5/28

5/5

76, Submitted with ~~two~~ drafts to the District Magistrates and the Chief Inspector of Mines.

77 The file may be referred to the Prot^n Br for a note (vide para 75 of) for the issue of the letters.

Submitted for orders.

28/6 Please issue & submit.

3/6

Books have not received back from Bangalore

1/6

2/6.

3, 10. the Dt. Magistrate.

No. D12950-7 dt 6-6-28,

Requests them to furnish the no. of cases for the fourth

NOTE.—Contn. sheet

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 100 of 192

Serial No.

5 years, in which the explosives licenses have been converted under Rule 52 of the Expl. Explosives Rule into an Arms Act license.

4 To the Chief Insp. of Mines
NO. D. 12958 Dt 6.6.28
states that Rule 52 of the Expl Explosives rules vest in the administering officer a discretion whether or not to give the explosives license the effect of an Arms Act license which is not clear why a person, holding an explosives license shd. necessarily require a license under the Arms Rules, and that Govt consider the best Solution is to delete the Rule 52, and advise him to furnish as to the no. of cases in which the explosives license have been converted into arms act licenses and whether the withdrawal of the advantage wd. cause any. real inconvenience
Resubmitted with reference to Para 3 of 78 Supt
Refd Para 5.
7/6
Prop Bn)
11/6

8) The file may be sent to this Branch after the information called for from the Dy. Master of the C. I. of Mines is received
Dev't Sect)
7/6

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 01714—GPE—30,000—18-4-28

General and Revenue Secretariat. Ecl File No. 100 of 1927.

Serial No.	
	81) Refer:— Para 80 of rep. the file will be opened, & kept in this till all the replies are rec'd. 2nd 14/6/28 VS 82) Yes. WG 19/6
	GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT 19 JUNE 1928 DEVELOPMENT BRANCH
5	From D.C. Chitr No. 13128 dt. 9-6-28. States that are no cases of the kind refd. to in 81 (3)
6	From D.C. Mysore No. S.3.1191 dt. 16-6-28 States that there are 27-8 no cases of the kind refd. to in 81 (3) & encloses a list of explosives licenses endorsed under the Arms Act for change
7	From D.M. ~~Tumkur~~ Bangalore No. JC. 5-384/27-8 dt. 15/6/28 Furnishes the information called for (81 3)
8	From D.M. ~~Bangalore~~ Tumkur No JC. ~~5-384~~ 485/27-8 dt. 18/6/28
	83) Reports from other Dists. are awaited. 2nd 25/6/28 VS 84) Seen WG 26/6

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 01714—GPB—30,000—18-4-28

11510
23
490

27

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. Ecol File No. 100 of 192 7

Serial No.	
9	From the Dist mag. Kolar No. D2 Dis 324/27-28 dt 28 6/28 states that there are no instances of the kind called for 85/ Replies from the Dist. magtes. of Hassan, Shimoga & Kadur and also from the Chief Dirctr. of Mines awaited. DO 30/7/28. 85/ Pleas remind them VB 4/7
10	From Dist mag. Shimoga No. J 1 of 27/28-29 dt 9-7-28 forwards a statement ~~X~~ showing the no. of cases in which the explosives licences have been converted into those issued under Mines rules 87/ Reminder to Dt. mag. of Hassan & Kadur sent DO 16/7/28 VB 88/ Issue VB 17/7
	Reminders issued - No. 612-3 dt 18 7/28
11	From the D. M. Kadur No. L. Dis. 3337/27-28 dt 30 7/28 furnishes the information

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT. 19 JULY 1928 DEVELOPMENT BRANCH.

NOTE—Contn. on

WD 01714—GPE—30,000—18-4-28

1.-11 93119

1168

28

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. Estt File No. 100 of 1927

Serial No.

called for in sl (3).

89) Report only from D. M. Hassan is due. Reminder has been issued only on 18.7.28

20/7/28. 90) Please another urgent reminder now & in the meanwhile, tabulate the information rec'd so far in a separate statement WG 7/8.

12 From the D. M. Hassan

No. 15336 dt 3-8-28.

Furnishes the information called for in sl. (3)

91) Replies from all the Dy. Comrs on the point have been rec'd, but the Chief Insp's report on the point raised in para 3 of this Office Communication (No D 12958 dt 6.6.28) has not been rec'd. Reminder is sub'd

D

9.8.28. 92) Issue WG 10/8/28

Reminder issued No. D. 1842 dt 11/8/28

CHIEF SECRETARIAT [illegible]

17 AUG 1928

DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

Contn. Sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat. Expl File No. 100 of 192 7

Serial No.

13 From the Chief Inspr of Mines
no. 276 of 15-8-28
states that a provision may
be made in the new Commissioners
of 1926 for a free Endorsement
on an Explosives licence
Corresponding to Rule 62, Indian
Explosives Rules

93) More information called for.
by the Pres: Bar in para 80 of rules (page
25) from the Dist magistrates & the C. I. of Mines is put up. & also file
may Therefore also lees such for there are
per Secy's orders in para 75 of rules
page. 24. for doing the needful
no 2578/28. (94) Prof Bar) MP 7/8

95) The addition of the proviso
to Explosives Rules 52, suggested by the
Devl. Secretary in para. 73, will meet the
case. It will have to be made after
previous publication in accordance with
S. 15 of the Expl. Rules. This is a rule to be
issued under S. 13 of the Expl. Rules, not
under any of the provisions of the Arms Rules &
cannot therefore be incorporated in the Arms Rules.

(Secy) 96) I agree 28/8
Devsec) with (copies—
MP 1/9 1/9/28

RECEIVED BY THE GOVT OF INDIA FIRST 1 SEP. 1928 No. 1474
REV. SECRETARIAT
1 SEP. 1928
NOTE—Cont. Sheet.
DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

97) I agree 3/9/28 (1st Member) 3/9/28

WD 01714—GPB—30,000—18-4-28

1070

30

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. Estt File No. 100 of 1927.

Serial No.	
	98) Draft Instrs.
	ne 4.9.28 99) Dft notifn for appt (Sec'y D) WP 5/9
5/9	101) Please show to Pens. Br. before issue. WP 5/9/28
	101) Prof Br with compts WP 5/9
	102) A revised draft in the form usually adopted in such cases is put up.
	103) The date by which suggestions/objections, if any, should reach Govt, has to be inserted in the draft before issue— (Secr Br.) WP 6/9
	Urgent 104) Submit under reference to item 100 of Register the draft issued forwarded ne 14.9.28
	105) For perusal before issue (Sec'y D) WP 14/9/28
	106) Issue WP 15/9/28
	WP 15/9

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT DEVELOPMENT BRANCH.

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 01714—GPB—30,000—18-4-28

1470

37

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. Gen'l File No. 100 of 1927.

Serial No.	
16	To the Compiler, Supplementary Gazette No. D. 3406 dt 19.9.28 forwards a preliminary notification amending Rule 52 and states that it will be taken into consideration after the 15th Oct. 1928 To The Chief Inspr of Mines No. D. 3407 dt 19.9.28 forwards copy of the above 107) the stipulated period was 15/10/28 & since no objection was received a final draft notification is filed. for appl 20/ 18.10.28 (Sd/ D) (1st Member) 108) Draft notifn for appl MD 19/10 19/10/28 MD 20/10 109) Notified 22/10/28 110) Issued 23/10/28 MD 23/10

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT. 2710 22 SEP. 1928 DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

OFFICE OF THE ... COUNCIL 1 OCT. 1928 No. 2590

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 01714—GPB—30,000—18-4-28

Serial No.	
15	To The Compiler Mysore Geol. No D 87 d 27/10/28 Notifies the addition of a proviso to Rule 52 of the Mysore Explosives Rules. To the Chief Inspr of Mines No. Comp-D. 87 d 27-10-28 Forwards copy of the above

B

4960
P 826

No.P.C.219/26-27. Office of the District Magistrate,

Shimoga District.

Dated, Shimoga the 25th April 1927.

From,

B.T. Kesavaiengar, Esquire, B.A., Pol 195-26

District Magistrate,

Shimoga District.

To,

B. Nagappa, Esquire, Bar-at-law,

Secretary to Government,

Law Department,

Bangalore.

Sir,

I have the honor to state that in the revised Arms Rules, the proviso that existed under rule 13 of the old Rules has been omitted. As such a corresponding change in Rule 52 of the Explosive Rules ought to have been made. But this has not been made. The omission above referred to appears to be with the idea that no free license in Forms IV of the Revised Arms Rules should be issued. If the Explosive License is endorsed as directed in Rule 52, Government stands to lose Rs 7-8-0 as the Explosive License ~~fixed~~ fee is only Rs 2-8-0 for possessing 50 lbs. at a time. The discretion to endorse could have been freely exercised if the explosive license fee had been raised to Rs 10/-. But so long as it continues at Rs 2-8-0, the endorsement contemplated in rule 52 cannot be made in the interest of Government revenue. Every man who in the ordinary course will have to take a license in form IV under the Arms Rules, may obtain an explosive License for Rs 2-8-0 and obtain an endorsement under rule 52, of the explosive rules for a free license in form IV. Under these circumstances, I solicit clear instructions in the matter.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

G. Krishna Rao

For District Magistrate,
Shimoga District.
(Absent from HQ 2m)

APP. F. VI. 61.]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section Police

File No. 195-26

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

No. P 6435

To

The Chief Inspector
Chennai & Nagpur

General and Revenue Secretariat
( )
the 192

Date of issue 18/6/27

Signed by Asst. to S. M.

I am directed to request you to forward at your earliest convenience ~~three~~ copies of the latest British Indian Explosive Rules and to enquire whether there are any differences in the rates of fees charged for a license to possess and sell explosives under these Rules and whether there are any differences between these rules and those in the Indian Arms Rules in the matter of fees charged for a license to possess and sell arms and ammunition under the Indian Arms Rules and if

Enclosures.....

.....

.....

over

WD 01265—GPB—31,000—24-12-25

368
P 827

D. M. E 7.]

DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND EXPLOSIVES.

Telegraphic address;—
"MINESPECTOR."

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES IN MYSORE.

No. 84
Encl 2 copies of Rules (sent separately)

Dated Oorgaum, 15th July 1927.
(S. India.)

FROM

C.E. Suryanarayana Rao, Esq., Mem. A.I.M.E., etc.,

Ag. CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES IN MYSORE.

Pol 195-263

To

B. Nagappa, Esq., Bar-at-Law.,
Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Law Department, BANGALORE.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. P.6435/Police, dated 18th June 1927, I have the honour to forward, under separate cover, for reference and return when done with, a copy each of Indian Explosive Rules, 1914, and Indian Arms Rules, 1924. Licenses to possess and sell explosives under the former are issued in Forms A, B and D and the maximum amount of fee leviable on a license in Form A is Rs.20/-, in Form B Rs.10/- and in Form D also Rs.10/-. The amount of fee charged on a license in any of these forms varies with the quantity of explosives allowed to be dealt with at any one time. If 200 lbs. (maximum) are allowed to be dealt with, the maximum fee above mentioned is levied; if 100 lbs. are allowed only half the maximum fee is charged and if 50 lbs. quarter the maximum.

2 Under the Arms Rules a uniform rate of fee, viz: Rs.20/- and Rs.10/- irrespective of the quantity licensed, obtains on licenses in Forms XI and XII respectively of the Indian Rules (corresponding to Forms III and IV of the Mysore Arms Rules, 1926) which explosives licensees claim free of charge in pursuance of Rule 63, Chapter VII, Indian Explosives Rules or Rule 52, Mysore Explosives Rules.

Thus, it is only when explosives licensees who have paid only Rs.5/- or Rs.2/8 as fee for their licenses claim free endorsement under the above Rule, that the question of reconciliatio

of

CESRao

of fees under the two Rules arises.

4) The Chief Inspector of Explosives in India who was consulted in the matter is of opinion that the question of fees does not arise while endorsing an explosives license in pursuance of Rule 63 above quoted, the discretion vesting with the authority granting the license (copy of his letter is enclosed for reference). Till recently the practice in Mysore was to endorse explosives licenses free of charge for Arms Act purposes in pursuance of sub para of Rule 13, Mysore Arms Rules, 1917. But this sub para having been omitted in the revised Arms Rules of 1926, some of the District Magistrates refused to endorse Explosives licenses for Arms Act purposes according to Rule 52, Mysore Explosives Rules, their contention being that there is no corresponding provision in the Revised Arms Rules 1926, while other District Magistrates continued to endorse as in the past explosives licenses under Rule 52, Mysore Explosives Rules. On representations made to this Department by several licensees regarding this altered procedure in some Districts, the various District Magistrates were addressed to furnish their views on certain proposals I put forward to obviate the above difficulty. Replies have been received from most of the District Magistrates so far except the District Magistrates of Tumkur and Mysore and all of them agree to my proposal which is as follows:-

> " A clause similar to sub para of Rule 13,
> " Mysore Arms Rules, 1917, may be added to
> " the New Rules of 1926 with the proviso
> " that a licensee under the Explosives Rules,
> " who applies for the endorsement of his
> " license under Rule 52 thereof, shall have
> " paid the amount of fee prescribed under
> " the Arms Rules for the license, which
> " he claims free of charge." This procedure
> does not entail any loss of revenue to
> Government.

If

(5) If my proposal is approved by Government the Mysore Arms Rules, 1926, will have to be suitably amended to admit of the grant of Arms Act licenses free of charge to licensees under the Explosives Regulation.

(6) It may be mentioned here that Froms II and III referred to in the sub para of Rule 13, Mysore Arms Rules, 1917, correspond to Forms III and IV of the revised 1926 Rules and the fees chargeable on these licenses are Rs.20/- and Rs.10/- respectively.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

C E S Rau

Ag. CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES

IN MYSORE.

R.S.

D.O. letter No. E-7(25) dated Calcutta, the 8th July 1927 from the Chief Inspector of Explosives in India, to the Chief Inspector of Mines in Mysore.

Your Demi-official No.2272, dated the 30th June 1927. I do not think it is necessary to issue a separate license under the Indian Arms Rules to a holder of a license under the Indian Explosives Rules as an endorsement on a license under the latter rules itself has the effect of a like license under the former rules. The question of fees, therefore, does not arise. But Arms Act Rules are not administered by this Department.

It will also be noticed from the foot note to license forms A, B and D of the Explosives Rules that certain additional conditions are to be added when the above mentioned endorsement is made on a license in pursuance of rule 63 of the Explosives Rules.

"C o p y"

C S Rau

Ag. CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES

15-7-27. IN MYSORE.

R.S.

APP. VI. GL.]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section Police
File No. 195-26
Serial No. 4

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

No. 870

To

The Chief Inspector of Arms
Lt Regent

General and Revenue Secretariat
( )
the 192

Date of issue 10/8/27

Signed by M. [illegible]

Sir,

With reference to your letter No 84 dated 15th July 1927 regarding the proposed amendment to the Regent Arms Rules of 1926, I am desired to request you to send up for reference, the letters received from the Dist Magistrates so far and also to obtain and send the opinions of the District Magistrates of Trincomalee and Regent on the matter.

I have &c
Secy. to Govt.
Law Dept

List of enclosures.....

Copied by [illegible]

Examined by.....

over

WD 01265—GPB—31,000— 24-12-25

826
P 827

M.E. 34]

DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND EXPLOSIVES.

Telegraphic address:
"MINESPECTOR."

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES IN MYSORE,

No. 226
Encl. 7

Dated Oorgaum, ...11th.....August.....*1927.*
(S. India)

Pol 195-26—5

FROM

C.E. Suryanarayana Rao, Esq., Mem. A.I.M.E., Etc.,
~~RxxBOCCqKEKxEsqxxKP~~.,

Ag. CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES IN MYSORE.

To

B. Nagappa, Esq., Bar-at-Law.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore, Law Department,
BANGALORE.

Sir,

Adverting to your letter No. P.870/Police 195-26-4 dated 10th August 1927 re: the proposed amendment to the Mysore Arms Rules of 1926, I have the honour to forward herewith for the information of Government copies of letters received from the District Magistrates of Shimoga, Hassan, Kolar, Kadur, Chitaldrug and Bangalore furnishing their views on the proposed amendments to the Mysore Arms Rules.

The District Magistrates of Mysore and Tumkur Districts have again been written to this day calling for their views in the matter and their replies will be submitted to Government when received.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

C E S Rau

Ag. CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES

IN MYSORE.

R. S.

Letter No.J.1.2305/26-27 dated 14th May 1927 from the District Magistrate, Shimoga District, to the Chief Inspector of Mines in Mysore.

---:o:---

With reference to your letter No.2020-28 dated 10th May 1927 calling for my views in the matter of issuing free licenses in form IV under the revised Arms Rules to persons who possess licenses under the Explosives Regulation, I have the honour to forward herewith a copy of this office letter No. P.C.219/26-27 dated 26th April 1927 addressed to the Secretary, Law Department, soliciting instructions in the matter and to state that the letter fully explains the circumstances under which a free license under the revised Arms Rules cannot be issued specially in the interest of Government Revenue. I would suggest that instead of amending the Arms Rules, the fees prescribed for a license in Form B under the Explosives Rules may be raised to equal those prescribed for a license in form IV under the Arms Rules.

----:o:----

" Copy "

C S Rau

Ag. CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES

11-8-27 IN MYSORE.

R.S.

Letter No.P.C.219/26-27 dated 26th April 1927 from the District Magistrate, Shimoga District, to the Secretary to Government, Law Department, Bangalore.

------:o:-----

I have the honour to state that in the revised Arms Rules the proviso that existed under rule 13 of the old rules has been omitted. As such a corresponding change in Rule 52 of the Explosives Rules ought to have been made. But this has not been made. The omission above referred to appears to be with the idea that no free license in Form IV of the revised Arms Rules should be issued. If the Explosive License is endorsed as directed in Rule 52, Government stands to lose Rs.7-8-0 as the explosive license fee is only Rs.2-8-0 for possessing 50 lbs. at a time. The discretion to endorse could have been freely exercised if the explosive license fee had been raised to Rs.10/-. But so long as it continues at Rs.2-8-0 the endorsement contemplated in rule 52 cannot be made in the interest of Government revenue. Every man who in the ordinary course will have to take a license in form IV under the Arms Rules, may obtain an explosive license for Rs.2-8-0 and obtain an endorsement under rule 52, of the Explosives Rules for a free license in Form IV. Under these circumstances I solicit clear instructions in the matter.

" Copy "

C S Rau

Ag. CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES

11-8-27. IN MYSORE.

R.S.

Letter No.1.J.752/26-27 dated 31st May 1927 from the District Magistrate, Hassan District to the Chief Inspector of Mines in Mysore.

With reference to your letter No.2020-28 dated 10th May 1927, I have the honour to state that in this district free licenses under the Arms Rules are being issued to licensees under the Explosives Rules. In accordance with Rule 52, Mysore Explosives Rules, an endorsement is made on the Explosives License that it shall have the effect of a like license granted under the Arms Rules and no separate fee is levied for dealing in ammunition or military stores.

With a view to make the matter clear and bring about a uniformity of practice in granting free licenses under the Arms Rules to holders of licenses under the Explosives Rules, I am of opinion that the Arms Rules 1926, should be suitably amended to admit of the grant of free licenses to licensees under the Explosives Rules.

---------:o:--------

" Copy " ,

C.S.Rao

Ag.CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES

IN MYSORE.

11-8-27.

R.S.

Letter No.2859 dated 2nd June 1927 from the District Magistrate, Kolar District to the Ag. Chief Inspector of Mines in Mysore.

Adverting to your letter No.2020-28 dated 10th May 1927, in the matter of grant of Arms Act licenses, free of charge, to holders of licenses under the Mysore Explosives Rules, etc., I have the honour to state that the non-existence of a provision in the Mysore Arms Rules of 1926 similar to the one contained in sub para of Rule 13 of the old Arms Rules of 1917, works as a real hardship to the holders of licenses under Rule 52 of the Mysore Explosives Rules, to pay for a license under the Arms Regulation and I am of opinion that the Mysore Arms Rules of 1926, requires to be suitably amended on the limes suggested by you.

---------:o:---------

"C o p y"

C E S Rau.

Ag.CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES

11-8-27. IN MYSORE.

R.S.

Letter No. L.Dis.4383/26-27 dated 7th June 1927 from the District Magistrate, Kadur District, to the Chief Inspector of Mines in Mysore.

---:o:---

Grant of Arms Rules licenses (Form No.III and IV) free of charge to holders of licenses under the Explosives Rules.

With reference to your letter No.2020-28/ dated the 10th May 1927, requesting to be furnished with my views in the matter of granting free of charge, licenses in forms III and IV of the Mysore Arms Rules of 1926, to holders of licenses under the Mysore Explosives Rules, I have the honour to state that the concession referred to may be granted by making provision in the New Arms Rules similar to the provision contained in para 2 of Rule 13 of the Mysore Arms Rules of 1917 (cancelled by the Rules of 1926).

----:o:----

"Copy"

C E S Rau

Ag. CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES

11-8-27. IN MYSORE.

R.S.

Letter No. J.L.Dis. C.51 of 26-27 dated 14th June 1927 from the District Magistrate, Chitaldrug District, to the Chief Inspector of Mines in Mysore.

-----:o:----

Adverting to your letter No.2020-28 dated 10-5-27. calling for my views in the matter of granting Arms Act licenses free of charge to holders of licenses under the Mysore Explosives Rules, I have the honour to state that in circumstances pointed out by you I agree with you that the abridged Mysore Arms Rules of 1926 should be suitably amended so as to admit of the grant of Arms Act licenses free of charge, provided of course that a licensee under the Explosives Rules has paid the amount of fee prescribed under the Arms Rules.

-----:o:-----

" Copy "

C E S Rau

Ag. CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES

11-8-27. IN MYSORE.

R.S.

Letter No. E.G.P.235/27 dated 6/16th June 1927 from the District Magistrate, Bangalore District to the Chief Inspector of Mines in Mysore.

With reference to your letter No.2020-28 dated 10th May 1927, in the matter of granting Arms Act licenses free of charge to holders of licenses under the Mysore Explosives Rules, I have the honour to state that in this District holders of licenses in Forms A and B under the Mysore Explosives Rules are granted free of charge licenses under the Arms Regulation to deal in shots and sulphur.

" Copy "

C.S.Rao

Ag. CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES

11-8-27. IN MYSORE.

R.S.

D.M.E. 34.]

Telegraphic address:
"MINESPECTOR."

DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND EXPLOSIVES. 17

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES IN MYSORE.

Dated, Oorgaum, 22nd August 1927.
(S. India.)

No. 298.
Encl. 1

1054
P

FROM C.E. Suryanarayana Rao, Esq., Mem. A.I.M.E., Etc.,
~~R. BOCQUET, Esq., J.P.,~~
Ag. CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES IN MYSORE.

To

B. Nagappa, Esq., Bar-at-Law.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore, Law Department,
BANGALORE.

Sir,

In continuation of this office letter No. 226 dated 11th inst., I have the honour to forward herewith for the information of Government a copy of letter received from the District Magistrate, Mysore District, furnishing his views on the proposed amendments to the Mysore Arms Rules.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

CESRau

Ag. CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES
IN MYSORE.

R. S.

Letter No. Cl.1872 dated 17th August 1927 from the District Magistrate, Mysore District, to the Chief Inspector of Mines in Mysore.

With reference to your No.2020-28 dated 10th May 1927 requesting for my opinion in the matter of an amendment to the Arms Rules of 1926 to admit of the grant of licenses free of charge to licensees under the Explosives Regulation, I have the honour to state that a similar provision free grant of Arms licenses to holders of explosives licenses as in the Arms Rules of 1917 may be got inserted in the New Arms Rules of 1926 as well.

--------:o:--------

" Copy "

C.S.Rau

Ag. CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES

IN MYSORE. 22-8-27.

R.S.

D.M.E. 36.]

Telegraphic address:
"MINESPECTOR."

DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND EXPLOSIVES

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES IN MYSORE.

Dated, Oorgaum.....2nd....November...1927.
(S. India.)

No. 749.
Encl.

FROM

C. E. Suryanarayana Rao, Esq., Mem.A.I.M.E., &c.
~~BOCQUET, Esq., I.P.~~
Ag. CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES IN MYSORE.

To

B. Nagappa, Esq., Bar-at-Law,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore, Law Department,
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.P.2222/Police dated 1-11-1927 re: proposed amendment to the Mysore Arms Rules of 1926, I have the honour to state that the views of the District Magistrate, Tumkur, have not yet been received and that an urgent reminder has again been sent to him today.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

C E S Rau

Ag. CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES IN MYS

APPENDIX VI. Gl.]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section

File No.

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

No. 2222

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To The Chief Inspector of Mines

Sir

Date of issue 2/11/27

Signed by M'Ls

With reg to your letter No 226 D/11-8-27 re. the proposed amendment to the Mysore Arms Rules of 1926, I am directed to request you to be so good as to State whether the views of the Dt Magte Tumkur called for by you has since been received and if so to forward the same ~~without further~~ delay early

Thanks etc

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by .....

for Secretary to Govt

WD 0562 -GPB—31,000—17-8-25

for Secretary to Govt

D.M.E. 34.]

Telegraphic address:
"MINESPECTOR."

329/27

DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND EXPLOSIVES.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES IN MYSORE.

Dated, Oorgaum,.....4th....January.....*192* 8 21
(S. India.)

No. 1133
Encl. One

FROM C.E. Suryanarayana Rao, Esq., Mem.A.I.M.E., &c.,
Ag. CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES IN MYSORE.

TO

B. Nagappa, Esq., Bar-at-Law.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore, Law Department,
Bangalore.

8.
5/1.
5
5/11
1

Sir,

In continuation of this office letter No.298 dated 22nd August 1927, I have the honour to forward herewith for the information of Government a copy of letter received from the District Magistrate, Tumkur District, furnishing his views on the proposed amendments to the Mysore Arms Rules.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

C E S Rau

Ag. CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES
IN MYSORE.

Letter No.J.C.428/26-27 dated 23rd December 1927 from the Deputy Commissioner and District Magistrate, Tumkur District, to the Chief Inspector of Mines in Mysore, Oorgaum.

----------:o:----------

With reference to your letter No.2020-28 of the 10th May 1927, re: the free grant of licenses under the Arms Act to the holders of licenses under the Mysore Explosives Rules, I have the honour to state that the Arms Rules of 1926 do not contain any provision similar to sub-para of Rule 13 in the Arms Rules of 1917, to grant a free license. The repetition of the rule seems necessary and the Government may be moved in the matter.

-------:o:---------

. " C o p y ".

C E S Rau

Ag. CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES

4-1-28. IN MYSORE.

R.S.

1563

7563 X 576 - P 43

In all future communications please quote—
No. Dep. 235/26-27
Enc.

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
BANGALORE DISTRICT.

Dated Bangalore, the 2nd February *192* 8.

FROM

G. B. HEBLIKAR, ESQ., B.A., L.L.B.,
~~*Deputy Commissioner*~~, District Magistrate,
Bangalore District.

43

To

B. Nagappa, Esq., Bar-at-law.,
Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Law Department, Bangalore.

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT.
7563
7 MAR 1928
DEVELOPMENT BRANCH.

SUBJECT :—

SIR,

In enclosing herewith copies of correspondence on the subject of the exemption from payment of fees on licenses issued for the possession and sale of sulphur granted under the Arms Rules, I have the honor to state that the omission of rule 13 of the old rules in the New Arms Rules published under notification No.P.6713/Police 142-23 dated 30th June 1926, seems conclusively to point out that the exemption originally given in favour of licenses in forms Nos.2 and 3 now 3 and 4 has been withdrawn.

In the view expressed by the Inspector of Explosives in his letter No.2020-28 dated 6th May 1927, I beg to enquire whether a separate fee of ten rupees should not be recovered in the case of licenses to possess and sell sulphur.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

G B Heblikar

District Magistrate,
Bangalore District.

L.S.R.

Letter No.2C80-86 dated 10th May 1927 from the Acting Chief Inspector of Mines in Mysore to the District Magistrate, Bangalore District, Bangalore.

I have the honour to state that several instances of the discontinuance of the practice, hitherto in vogue, of granting Arms Act Licenses, free of charge, to holders of licenses under the Mysore Explosives Rules, have been brought to the notice of this Department. From enquiries made, it is gathered that the reason for refusal to grant free Arms Act Licenses on the authority of explosives licenses for which payment has been made, is the non-provision therefor in the new ~~Arms~~ Mysore Arms Rules, 1926.

Rule 58, Mysore Explosives Rules, provides:-

"Any authority granting a license under
" these rules may, if such authority thinks
" fit, direct by an order written in the
" license that it shall have the effect of a
" like license granted by the like authority
" under the Mysore Arms Regulation of 1890".

Similarly in the Mysore Arms Rules, 1917, sub-para of Rule 13 provided:-

"Notwithstanding anything contained in this
" rule, a person holding a license under the
" Mysore Explosives Regulation, II of 1886,
"endorsed in accordance with Rule 58 of the
" rules thereunder, to manufacture, possess
" and sell, or to possess and sell, explosives,
" may be granted free of all charge a license
" for the same period in Form II or Form III,
" respectively, in regard to ammunition or
" military stores which are not explosives."

In the abridged Mysore Arms Rules, 1926, however the latter provision does not seem to exist, and therefore explosives licensees, who wish to deal in ammunition or military stores, are denied the grant of Arms Act Licenses free of charge.

This is a real hardship experienced by such of the explosives Act Licensees who wish to deal in articles coming under either Regulation holding a license under one of the 2 Regulations. Inasmuch as Rule 58, Mysore Explosives Rules is allowed to stand as it is, it is only reasonable that a clause as in the Cl Arms Rules 1917, should be introduced in the new Rules, 1926.

It may be mentioned here that Forms II and III of the 1917 Arms Rules correspond to Forms III and IV of the [illegible] and the fees chargeable on licenses in these forms are [illegible]

95

and t[illegible] respectively. Provided [illegible] rules, [illegible] he applies for a free license under the [illegible], he otherwise paid the amount of [illegible] rules for the license which he claims free of [illegible], I see no objection for his request being granted.

Under these circumstances I am of opinion that the [illegible] Rules, 1965, should be suitably amended to add it to the list of licensees free of charge to [illegible] regulation. I shall be glad if you [illegible] your views in the matter at an early date.

" COPY "

[signature]

District Magistrate,
Bangalore District.

21

P. F. VI. G(1)

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section Genl

File No. 100-27

Serial No. /

No. D-8144

Diary No. of letter replied to.....5906.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To The Offg: Chief Justice of Burma

Date of issue.....2-2-28.....

Signed by.....for V. V. A.....

Sir

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter No 1133 of 4.1.28 to the address of the Govt. Law Dept. on the matter of amending the Insurance Commn Rules of 1926 I am directed to enquire whether it would not be better to add a rule as

List of enclosures.....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

over

like the one suggested by Govt in Govt letter No. 84 of 15.7.27 to the Nagpur Explosives Rules instead of to the Census Rules

The favour of an early reply is requested

Yours truly

W H Haverfield

Dy

JS

Geol 100-27-2.

D. M. E 7.]

DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND EXPLOSIVES.

Telegraphic address;—
"MINESPECTOR."

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES IN MYSORE.

No. 1457.
Encl. 1

Dated Oorgaum, 4th FEBRUARY 1928.
(S. India.)

6579

GEN. & REV. BRANCH
FEB. 1928
DEVELOPMENT

FROM C.E. Suryanarayana Rao, Esq., Mem.A.I.M.E., &c.,
Ag. CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES IN MYSORE.

To

N. Rama Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Development Departments, Bangalore.

Sir,

1. With reference to your letter No.D.8144/Geol. 100-27-1 dated 2nd inst. enquring whether it would not be better to add a rule similar to the one suggested by me in my letter No.84 dated 15th July 1927 to the Mysore Explosives Rules instead of to the Mysore Arms Rules, I have the honour to state as follows:-

2. Rule 52 of the Mysore Explosives Rules is quite clear in the matter of endorsing an explosives license for Arms Act purposes and requires no modification.

3) In the old Mysore Arms Rules of 1917 sub para of Rule 13 provided:-

> "Notwithstanding anything contained
> "in this rule, a person holding a
> "license under the Mysore Explosives
> "Regulation, II of 1888, endorsed in
> "accordance with rule 52 of the rules
> "thereunder, to manufacture, possess
> "and sell, or to possess and sell
> "explosives may be granted free of all
> "charge a license for the same period
> "in Form II or Form III, respectively,
> "in regard to ammunition or military
> "stores which are not explosives."

4) In the abridged New Mysore Arms Rules of 1926, however, the latter provision does not exist, and therefore the District Magistrates have in several instances refused to endorse an explosives license to enable the holder thereof to deal in ammunition and military stores. This refusal caused considerable hardship to the licensees.

It is to obviate this difficulty that I suggested a suitable amendment similar to sub para of Rule 13 of the old Arms Rules. But, if the sub para of Rule 13, old Mysore Arms Rules is re-introduced in the new Mysore Arms Rules there will be a loss of revenue to Government in some cases in the shape of license fees. This point has been clearly explained in my Circular letter addressed to the District Magistrates - copy enclosed for reference - to elicit their opinion on this subject.

5) The new amendment suggested to the Mysore Arms Rules will enable the District Magistrates to endorse the Explosives Licenses to enable the holders thereof to deal in ammunition and military stores not in all cases, as it existed in the past, but only in such cases where the fee paid for an explosives license is either equal to or in excess of the fee prescribed for holding a similar license under the Mysore Arms Rules.

6) The amendment clause may run as follows:-

> "Provided a licensee under the Explosives
> "Rules who applies for a free endorsement
> "of his license for Arms Act purposes
> "shall have paid the fee prescribed under
> "the Arms Rules for the license which he
> "claims free of charge."

7) If this clause is introduced in the new Arms Rules there will be no loss of revenue to Government and relief will have been afforded to Explosives Licensees.

8) Unless there is a reciprocal provision in the New Arms Rules as there is already in Rule 52 of Mysore Explosives Rules the licensing authorities are not likely to view the applicants' claim for endorsement of their licenses with favour. I am therefore of opinion that the Arms Rules, 1926, should be suitably amended accordingly.

I have the honour to be,
Sir
Your most obedient servant,

C E S Rau

Ag. CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES
IN MYSORE.

R.S.

Circular letter No.2020-28 dated 10th May 1927 from the Ag. Chief Inspector of Mines in Mysore to the District Magistrates of Districts.

--------: o :-------

I have the honour to state that several instances of the discontinuance of the practice, hitherto in vogue, of granting Arms Act Licenses, free of charge, to holders of licenses under the Mysore Explosives Rules, have been brought to the notice of this Department. From enquiries made, it is gathered that the reason for refusal to grant free Arms Act licenses on the authority of explosives licenses for which payment has been made, is the non-provision therefor in new Mysore Arms Rules, 1926.

2. Rule 52, Mysore Explosives Rules, provides:-

> "Any authority granting a license under "these Rules may, if such authority thinks "fit, direct by an order written on the "license that it shall have the effect of "a like license granted by the like "authority under the Mysore Arms Regulation "of 1890."

3 Similarly in the Mysore Arms Rules, 1917, sub-para of Rule 13 provided:-

> "Notwithstanding anything contained in "this rule, a person holding a license "under the Mysore Explosives Regulation, "II of 1888, endorsed in accordance with "Rule 52 of the rules thereunder, to "manufacture, possess and sell, or to "possess and sell, explosives may be "granted free of all charge a license "for the same period in Form II or Form "III, respectively, in regard to "ammunition or military stores which "are not explosives."

4. In the abridged Mysore Arms Rules, 1926, however the latter provision does not seem to exist, and therefore

explosives

explosives licensees, who wish to deal in ammunition or military stores, are denied the grant of Arms Act licenses free of charge.

5. This is a real hardship experienced by such of the Explosives and Arms Act Licensees who wish to deal in articles coming under either Regulation holding a license under one of the 2 Regulations. Inasmuch as Rule 52, Mysore Explosives Rules, is allowed to stand as it is, it is only reasonable that a clause as in the old Arms Rules, 1917, should be introduced in the New Rules 1926.

6. It may be mentioned here that Forms II and IIIreferred to in the 1917 Arms Rules correspond to Forms III and IV of the 1926 Rules and the fees chargeable on licenses in these forms are rupees twenty and ten respectively. Provided a licensee under the Explosives Rules, who applies for a free license under the Arms Rules, has otherwise paid the amount of fee prescribed under the Arms Rules for the license which he claims free of charge, I do not see any objection for his request being granted.

7. Under these circumstances I am opinion that the Arms Rules, 1926, should be suitably amended to admit of the grant of licenses free of charge to licensees under the Explosives Regulation. I shall be glad if you can favour me with your views in the matter at an early date.

-------: o :-------

"C o p y"

C.S.Rau

Ag.CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES

IN MYSORE.

4/2/28

R.S.

A. F. - VI. GI}

32

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section Gool

File No. 100-27

Serial No. 3

No. D/2950-7

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To The District Magistrates.

Date of issue 6/6/28

Sir,

Signed by A. V. V. Chary

With refce to the Corrs. ending with yours and the Ch. Insp. of Mines, in the matter of amending the Mys. Arms Rules 1926, I am directed to request you to furnish very early for the infn of Govt. the no of cases if any, in which the Explosives licenses have been converted under Rule 52 of the Mys. Explosives Rules into an Arms Act license during the past 5 years.

I have the

List of enclosures.....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

MP 3/6 Secy to Govt 938 Home Dept

over

A, L. F. VI. G1]

33

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section Genl

File No. 100-27

Serial No. 4

No. D/12958

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To The Chief Insp^r of Mines,

Date of issue 6/6/28

Signed by W. V. Cleary

Sir,

With refce. to the Corre endg. with your office letter No 11657/B 47/28 in the matter of amending the Explos. Rules 1926, I am directed to state that Rule 52 of the Explosives Rules Vest in the administrating officer a discretion whether or not to give the explosives license the effect of an Arms Act license. It is not clear why a person holding an explosives license shd. necessarily require a license under the Arms Reg^s

List of enclosures.....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

over

WD0325—GPB—30,000—26-5-27.

~~under dated 8 cases of fuses and~~

Those cases Ammunition or Military

Stores which are not explosives Shd. properly

~~not~~ be dealt with under The Arms

Regn. In these circumstances

2) Govt. Consider That the best solution

~~in the circumstances of the Case~~ wd be

to delete Rule 52. of the Explosives Rules.

3) I am directed to request you

to furnish infn as to the no. of cases

in which the Explosives licenses

have been converted by an endt under Rule 52 of the ~~old~~ Explosives Rules

into an Arms ~~Act~~ Rejwah licenses during

the first 5 years and whether the

deletion of Rule 52 of the Explosive Rules

and the withdrawal of the advantage

afforded by it would cause any

real inconvenience.

I have &c

WA 3/11

I Secy to Govt

Arms Rules.

Geol. 100-27-5.

Tel. Address:—Depcom,
CHITALDRUG.

In reply please refer to
No. C.A.13.28
Enclosures.

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
CHITALDRUG DISTRICT.

Dated Chitaldrug, 9th June 1928 192

D 11196

GEN. & REVENUE SECRETARIAT
12 JUNE 1928
DEVELOPMENT BRANCH.

FROM

The *District Magistrate,*
Chitaldrug District.

To

The Secretary to Government,
Development Departments,
B a n g a l o r e.

Sir,

Adverting to your letter No.D.12950-7/Geol.100-~~21~~27-3 dated 5/6th June 1928 calling for certain information in the matter of amending the Mysore Arms Rules 1926, I have the honor to state that there are no cases in this District in which the explosives licenses were converted under rule 52 of the Mysore Explosives Rules into an Arms Act license during the past 5 years.

I have the honor to be,
S I R,
Your most obedient servant,

For District Magistrate,
Chitaldrug District.

Geol 70 t.-27-6

No. G3-1191

Office of the District Magistrate,
Mysore District.

Dated Mysore, 14th June 1928

From

A.V. Ramanathan, Esq., B.A.,
District Magistrate, Mysore District.

To

N. Rama Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to Government of Mysore,
Development Department, Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.D. 12950-7/Cl. 100-27-3 dated 6th June 1928 calling for information for the past 5 years regarding instances in which the Explosive Licenses were converted under Rule 52 of the Mysore Explosive Rules into An Arms Act License, I have the honour to state that there are no such cases, but as per enclosed list, Explosive Licenses were also endorsed under Arms Act in either form No. IIor III free of charge prior to the introduction of the New Arms Rules of 1926, and after 1926 a fee of Rs. 10/ - was recovered for such an endorsement under the Arms Rules for license in form No.IV.

I have the honour to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

For District Magistrate,
Mysore District,
(Absent from Head Quarters)

Statement Showing the number of cases in which the Explosive Licenses have endorsed under rule 52 Mysore Explosive Rules in Mysore District during the years 1

year	Name of Licensee	Number and form of License	Fees paid	Rs.	Remarks.
1924. 1	Ibrahim Sab. Mysore city	B 1 & 3. of Arms Rules	10		
2	Krishna Ramiah Setty. Mysore	B 2 & do	10		
3					
1.3	Mir Rasali Hunsur.	B 3 & do	10		
4	Venkata chetty Chamarajnagar	B 4 & do	10		
5	Syed Abdul Anjum Mysore.	B 7 & do	10		
6	K. Annappa setty Nanjangud	B 8 & do	10		
7	H. R. Rajgopal Mudaliar Hunsur	B 9 & do	10		
8	Syed Abdul Razak Mysore City	B 10 & do	10		
9	Venkata setty. Gundlupet.	B 20 & do	10		
10	Mohamed Usman Mysore City	B 26 & do	10		
11	G. Rama Setty Saragur	B 27 & do	10		
1925	Same persons and same fees as in 1924.				
1926	Same persons and same fees as in 1925				
1927	Same persons, but an additional fee of Rs 10/- for endorsement in Form No IV of the Arms Rules received				

Figures of 1923 are nil

Mysore
14.6.24

For District Magistrate
Mysore District.

38 Ecdl. 100-27-3

J2.5384/27-28

Office of the District Magistrate,
Bangalore District,
Bangalore, dated the 15th June 1928.

From

G.B. Heblikar, Esqr., B.A., LL,B.,
District Magistrate, Bangalore District.

To

N. Rama Rao, Esqr., B.A., B.L.,
Development Secretary to the Government
of Mysore, Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. D.12950-7/Gnl. 100-27-3 dated 6th June 1928, requesting to furnish the number of cases if any in which the explosive licenses have been converted under - Rule 52 of the Mysore Explosive Rules into an Arms Act License during the past 5 years, I have the honor to append in the margin the statistics called for.

Year.	Licenses issued.
1923	29
1924	33
1925	25
1926	25
1927	24
Total	136

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
G.B. Heblikar
District Magistrate,
Bangalore District.

Genl 100-27-28

D. C. 4]

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
TUMKUR DISTRICT.

No. J 485/27-28 Dated Tumkur, 18th June 1928

FROM

K.V. Anantaraman, Esquire, B.A.,
Deputy Commissioner, & District Magistrate,
Tumkur District.

REV. SECT. RECEIVED 20 JUN 1928 DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

D 11570

TO

N. Rama Rao, Esquire, B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Development Department,
Bangalore.

SIR,

With reference to your No.D. 12950-7 dated 5/6th June 1928 in the matter regarding the Mysore Arms Rules 1926, I have the honor to note in the margin* the No. of cases in which the explosive licenses have been converted under Rule 52-of the Mysore Explosive Rules into an Arms Act.

*

Year	No. of cases.
1923	10
1924	10
1925	11
1926	10
1927	9

I have the honor to be,
sir,
Your most obedient servant.

For District Magistrate,
Tumkur District.
(Absent from the station)

AD. 18/6

UO Govt. 100-27-3

Office of the District Magistrate, Kolar District.

No. D2 Dis 324/27-28 Dated, Kolar, the 26th June 1928.

DEV. SECRETARIAT 23 JULY 1928 DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

From

A.K.Syed Taj Peeran, Esq., B.A.,
District Magistrate,
Kolar District.

To

N.Rama Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to Government of Mysore,
Development Department,
B a n g a l o r e.

Sir,

Referring to your letter No.D.12950-7/Geol.100-27-3 dated 5/6th June 1928 calling for information regarding the number of cases in which the Explosives licenses have been covered under Rule 52 of the Mysore Explosives Rules into an Arms Act License during the past 5 years, I have the honour to state that there have been no such instances in this District, during the above period.

I have the honour to be,

S i r,

Your most obedient servant,

Treasury Assistant Commissioner,
For District Magistrate,
Kolar District.

A.R.
26/6/28.

41 Geol. 100-27-10

In reply please quote
No. J.1. 22/28-29.

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER.
SHIMOGA DISTRICT.

Dated, Shimoga 9th July *1928.*

From

B. T. KESAVAIENGAR, Esq., B. A.,
District Magistrate,
Shimoga.

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT 1490 12 JULY 1928 DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

To

B. Nagappa, Esq., Bar-at-law,
Secretary to Government,
Law Department,
BANGALORE.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. D. 12950-7/Geol. 100-27-3 date 6th June 1928, I have the honor to forward herewith a statement showing the number of cases in which the explosive licenses have been converted under rule 52 of the Explosive Rules for purposes of Arms Act licenses during the past 5 years.

2. A copy of the letter addressed to the Chief Inspector of Mines in the matter of the addition of a proviso to rule 52 of the Explosive Rules is also appended for favour of information.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
B. Krishna Rao
For District Magistrate,
(absent on tour)
Shimoga District.

42

Letter No. J.1. 22/28-29 dated 7th July 1928 from the District Magistrate, Shimoga District to the Chief Inspector of Mines in Mysore, Bangalore.

****

With reference to your letter No. 2238-45 dated 8th June 1928, calling for my opinion in the matter of the deletion of rule 52 of the Rules under the Mysore Explosive Regulation, I have the honor to state that the addition of a proviso to rule 52, viz., "provided that the licensees under the Explosive Rules, who apply for a free endorsement of his license for Arms Act purposes, shall have paid the fees prescribed under the Arms Rules for the license which he claims free of charge" will mitigate the inconvenience referred to in the letter. A statement showing the number of licenses under the Explosive Rules which have been endorsed under Rule 52 thereof during the past 5 years is appended in the form received with your letter.

***

" C O P Y "

G. Krishnaiah

FOR DISTRICT MAGISTRATE.

81

Statement showing the Number of Cases in which the Explosive licenses have been endorsed under rule 52 Mysore Explosive Rules in the Shimoga district during the years 1923-1927

Statement showing the number of cases in which the Explosive licenses have been endorsed under Rule 52 Mysore Explosive rules in the Shimoga district during the years 1926 to 1927

Year	Name of licensee	No and form of License	Fee paid	Remarks

1925	20	M. Jagiganna Venkatakrishna	Sagar	36/1925	B.	2-8-0	Form No III No 21
	21	" C. Venkata Chelliah	Shimoga	38/1925	B	2-8-0	do No 22
	22	" M. Sahagiranna	Shimoga	39/1925	B	2-8-0	do No 23
	23	" K. S. Ramarao	Sagar	61/1925	B	2-8-0	do No 24
	24	" K. Linga Reddy	Sagar	63/1925	B	2-8-0	do No 25
	25	" M. Krishnappa	Nagar	64/1925	B	10-0-0	do No 26
1926	1	M. M. Krishnappa	Nagar	23/1926	B	10-0-0	do No 1
	2	" R. Sahagiranna	Sagar	26/1926	B	2-8-0	do No 2
	3	" N. Ramanappa	Sorab	22/1926	B	2-8-0	do No 3
	4	" K. Venkatakrishnappa	Shikaripur	60/1926	B	5-0-0	do No 4
	5	" M. Lakshmanappa	Shimoga	18/1926	B	2-8-0	do No 5
	6	" Sahagiranna	Shimoga	19/1926	B	2-8-0	do No 6
	7	" Bellada Basappa	Agrahara	13/1926	B	2-8-0	do No 7
	8	" T. Ramiah	Kallenahalli	24/1926	B	2-8-0	do No 8
	9	" Belgur Venkanna	Shimoga	5/1926	B	2-8-0	do No 9
	10	" Venkatachelliah	Shimoga	17/1926	B	2-8-0	do No 10
	11	" M. Anjanappa	Shimoga	7/1926	B	5-0-0	do No 11

	Z.W.M. Lakamineranappa Shenoi	4/1925	B	5-0-0		No 4
4	" Hemaji Hyderappa "	6/1925	B	5-0-0		No 5
5	" Y.S. Lakappa Dibbadalli	11/1925	B	2-8-0		No 6
6	" Rattehalli Lamanappa Sagar	12/1925	B	10-0-0		No 7
7	" R. Sekhapirappa Sagar	13/1925	B	2-8-0		No 8
8	" G. M. Kadappa & Sons Shenoi	14/1925	B	2-8-0		No 9
9	" S. M. Ramesh Shenoi	15/1925	B	5-0-0		No 10
10	" Kalle Dasappa Dibbadalli	24/1925	B	2-8-0		No 11
11	" N Siddappa Sonar	26/1925	B	2-8-0		No 12
12	" Rattehalli Siddappa Sagar	27/1925	B	10-0-0		No 13
13	" Jhon D'souza Dibbadalli	28/1925	B	2-8-0		No 14
14	" S. Obannavar Sagar	29/1925	B	2-8-0		No 15
15	" P. A Kale & Bros Sonar	30/1925	B	2-8-0		No 16
16	" Kanakappa Kallimalli	31/1925	B	0-0-0		No 17
17	" K Veerabhadrappa Shikaripur	32/1925	B	5-0-0		No 18
18	" Bellada Basappa Ayanur	33/1925	B	2-8-0		No 19
19	" Yellalinada Sangana Basappa	35/1925	B	5-0-0		No 20

1928 Til -

1924.	1 Mr. Y. Bheramiah Sagar.	35/1924	B.	2-8-0	Form No III No 21
	2 " V. Venkatachalapathy Shikarpur	37/1924	B.	10-0-0	Form No III No 22.
	3 " Rathchalli Sathyanarayana Sagar	38/1924	B	2-8-0	Form No III No 23.
	4 " I. Mayappa Chetty Shimoga for Imperial Gopalaswamy Chetty	41/1924	B	1-0-0 Charter cancelled portion from 25.10.24	Form No III No 24
	5 " K.A.C.C. Dharmalingam Dindigul	62/1924	B	2-8-0	Form No III No 25
1925	1 Mr Belgaum Venkamma Shimoga	2/1925	B	2-8-0	Form No III No 2
	2 " I. Thayappachetty for Imperial Gopalaswamy Chetty Shimoga	3/1925	B	2-8-0	0 No 3

12	"	Kalle Dakshappa Mitthalli	9/1926	B	2-8-0	Rs No 12
13	"	Kanakiyya Kallenahalli	20/1926	B	10-0-0	Rs No 13
14	"	P.R. Kale & Bros Sirsi	30/1926	B	2-8-0	Rs No 14
15	"	Jagira Bharamiah Sagar	31/1926	B	2-8-0	Rs No 15
16	"	Jagira Venkatappa Sagar	32/1926	B	5-0-0	Rs No 16
17	"	Nakkehalli Seemappa Sagar	33/1926	B	10-0-0	Rs No 17
18	"	R Seemappa Sagar	37/1926	B	10-0-0	Rs No 18
19	"	K. Ishwarappa Sagar	47/1926	B	2-8-0	Rs No 19
20	"	K.S. Rama Rao Sagar	39/1926	B	2-8-0	Rs No 20
21	"	John D'souza Mitthalli	40/1926	B	2-8-0	Rs No 21
22	"	H. Sangameshappa Shikaripur	41/1926	B	5-0-0	Rs No 22
23	"	E. Thayappakutti for Menon Kuppalavenkatavalli	42/1926	B	2-8-0	Rs No 23
24	"	K Madhva Rao Kallenahalli	43/1926	B	2-8-0	Rs No 24

927

Nil -

Shimoga
~~18/6/1926~~

7/7/26

District Magistrate
Shimoga

114

A. P. F. VI. G[illegible]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section Genl

File No. 100-27

Serial No.

No. D 612-3

To The District Magistrate of Hassan & Kadur

Sir

I am directed to invite your attention to this office No. ~~D.12950~~ D. 12950-7/Genl-100-27-3 of 6-6-28 requesting to be furnished with the No. of cases, if any, in which the Explosives licenses have been converted into those ~~Carrying~~ under the Arms Rules and to

over

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

Date of issue 18/7/28

Signed by Mr V. Venkataya

List of enclosures.....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

WD0925—GPL—30,000—26-5-27

request that the information
called for may be sent very
early

Dinesh

MP 17/-

Devdas

Geol. 10-0-27-11

WD 2332—GPB—450—5-8-22

D. M 3]

Office of the District Magistrate,
Kadur District.

No.L.Dis.3337/27-28. *Chikmagalur, dated* 30th July 1928.

From

H. V. Ramaswami, Esq., M.A., B.L.,

DISTRICT MAGISTRATE
KADUR DISTRICT.

GEN. & DEV. SECRETARIAT
991
DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

To

N. Rama Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,
Development Department, BANGALORE.

SIR,

Explosives licenses converted into Arms Act licenses under Rule 52 of the Explosives Rules.

With reference to your letter No. D.12950-7/Geol. 100-27-3 dated the 6th June 1928, calling for information as to the number of cases in which the Explosives licenses were converted under Rule 52 of the Mysore Explosives Rules into Arms Act licenses during the past 5 years, I have the honor to state that no explosives licenses were so converted in this District, during the years 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926 or 1927. But holders of Explosives licenses were being granted licenses in form III of the Mysore Arms Rules, 1917, free of cost, under Para 2 of Rule 13 of the Rules, during the years 1923, 1924, 1925, and 1926 since these rules were superceded by the Revised Rules of 1926 which came into effect from 1st September 1926, the licenses in form IV of the revised rules issued in the year 1927 were all on payment of the prescribed fees. The number of licenses issued during the past 5 years is noted in the margin.

1923 - 16)
1924 - 16) Free of all
1925 - 16) fee.
1926 - 16)
1927 - 13 @ Rs 10/- each.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

For District Magistrate,
Kadur District.

Ecol. 10-27-12

(47)

Office of the District Magistrate,
Hassan District,
Dated, Hassan the 3rd August 1928

No. /5336

From

S. Abdul Majid, Esq., B.A.,
District Magistrate, Hassan District.

To

Rama Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to Government Development Departments
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. D.14950-7/Geol 10-27-3 dated 6th June 1928, I have the honour to state that only 3 licenses granted during the year 1927 have been converted into those under the Mysore Arms Act Rules as per rule 52 of the Mysore Explosives Rules.

There do not appear to be any such cases during the years 1923 to 1926.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

DISTRICT MAGISTRATE,
HASSAN DISTRICT.

I.S.D.

48

A. P. F. VI. G1]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section Ecol

File No. 100-27

Serial No. R

No. D 1842

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To The Chief Inspr of Mines

Date of issue 11/8/28

Signed by Mr V. V. Charya

D

Sir

I am directed to invite your attention to para 3 of this office no. D. 12958/Ecol 100-27-4 dt 6.6.28 calling for information ~~as to~~ the number of Cases in which Explosives licenses have been converted into arms Regn licenses during the past 5 years & the deletion of Rule 52 of the Explosives

over

List of enclosures.....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

WD0125—GPB—30,000—26-5-27

16

Rules committee to request ~~that~~ the report called ~~for~~ there can may be handily filed at ~~a very early date~~ the favor of a very early reply

Blackwelder

MP 10/8

MP

for Dev't Leg

VS

Geol. 100-27-13

D. M. E 7.]

DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND EXPLOSIVES.

Telegraphic address;—
"MINESPECTOR."

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES IN MYSORE.

No. 276.
Encl.

Dated Oorgaum, 15th August 1928.
(S. India.)

FROM

C.E. Suryanarayana Rao, Esq., Mem.A.I.M.E., &c.,
~~R.x BOCQUET, Esq.,~~
Ag. CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES IN MYSORE.

Please put up in the file

To

14170
DEVELOPMENT

Geol - Please put up in the file
WP
16/8

N. Rama Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Development Departments, Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. D.12958/Geol.100-27-4 dated 6th June 1928 calling for information regarding the number of cases in which explosives licenses have been endorsed under Rule 52, Mysore Explosives Rules, for Arms Act purposes and the deletion of Rule 52, Mysore Explosives Rules, I have the honour to state that during the last 5 years on an average 27 explosives licenses a year in the Bangalore District, 18 in the Shimoga District, 11 in the Mysore District, 16 in the Kadur District and 10 in the Tumkur District have been endorsed to have the effect of a like license under the Mysore Arms Rules. In the Chitaldrug District, however, no licenses have been so endorsed as the concession afforded by the said rule has not been availed of by the licensees. Regarding Hassan and Kolar Districts, information has been called for from the two District Magistrates and the same will be submitted to Government on receipt.

2/ Regarding the observation why an explosives licensee should hold a license under the Arms Regulation, I might say that some of the articles sold under each license are common to both, such as gunpowder and other explosives belonging to the "Ammunition" class. The "Military Stores" including sulphur, salt petre, etc., coming under the operation of the Arms Rules are required by both the Arms and Explosives Licensees. It is with this object that a reciprocal provision was made in both the rules when originally framed to facilitate dealing in such articles coming under both regulations by either

licensee.

51

licensee. Such provision exists in the Indian Explosives Rules on which our rules are based - vide rule 63, Indian Explosives Rules, 1914. This does not mean that an explosives licensee would be entitled to claim any license under the Arms Rules free of charge. Only licensees in Forms III and IV under the Arms Rules, 1926, can be so claimed by an explosives licensee and not the rest. The discretion is always vested in the District Magistrate to refuse to grant such claim.

Under the above circumstances, many explosives licensees who have been enjoying the concession in the various Districts all these years will feel it a hardship if they are now made to pay for the Arms Act license separately. If my proposal is accepted, the loss of revenue to Government in allowing this concession to stand, is not much. I am therefore of opinion that a provision may be made in the new Arms Rules of 1926 for a free endorsement on an explosives license corresponding to Rule 52, Mysore Explosives Rules, to the following effect:-

> "provided a licensee under the Explosives
> "Rules who applies for a free endorsement
> "of his license for Arms Act purposes shall
> "have paid the fee prescribed under the
> "Arms Rules for the license which he claims
> "free of charge."

In other words, only those persons who have paid a fee of not less than Rs.10/- for an explosives license will alone be entitled to have their licenses endorsed free of charge to have a like effect under the Arms Rules.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

C.E.S.Rau

Ag.CHIEF INSPECTOR OF MINES

IN MYSORE.

R.S.

D.3406 Geol-100-27-14

NOTIFICATION.

Issued
19-9-28

The following draft amendment which the Government propose to make in exercise of the powers conferred on them under section 13 of the Mysore Explosives Regulation, 1888, to the Mysore Explosives Rules issued with Notification No. G. 9745/Geol. 69-15-17 dated 18th -- January 1918 ~~are~~ hereby published for the information of persons likely to be affected ~~thereby~~ thereby and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken into consideration on or after the 15th October 1928 and that any suggestions or objections which may be received from any person with respect to the said draft before the date aforesaid will be considered by Government.

Draft Amendment.

To Rule 52 of the Mysore Explosives Rules the following proviso shall be added:-

"Provided that if the fee levied under - these Rules is lower than that leviable under the Mysore Arms Rules the difference shall be recovered before such endorsement ~~is made~~ an order is on the license"

By Order,

UR
14/9

Secretary to Government
Law Department.

To

The Compiler, Mysore Gazette for publication

memo D3407/
copy forwarded with the
c.n. Despr of memo Bgorder

Law: 6 Govt
Dev: Depts

A. P. F. VI. G[illegible]

5-3

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section Genl

File No. 100-27

Serial No. 15

No. 87

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To Notification

Date of issue 27/10/28

Signed by Mr N.R.

D

The following addition to Rule 52 of the Mysore Explosives Rules the draft of which was notified in Pr. D. 3406/Genl. 100-27-14 dt 19.9.28, is issued and published for general information.

Add the following as a proviso to Rule 52 of the Mysore Explosives Rules

" Provided that if the fee levied under these Rules is lower than that

over

List of enclosures.....

a

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

WD0325—GPB—80,000—26-5-27

leviable under the Mysore Income
Rules the difference, shall
be recovered before such
an order is endorsed on
the license

By order

19/10 Sec to Govt Dev Depts

Mun 22/10/28.

To

The Compiler, Mysore
Gazette for publication
in the Gazette & with a
request that 50 copies of
the notifn may be supplied
to this office & 200 to the Chief
Inspr of Mines

memo. No D 88 of 21/10/28

Copy forwarded with
compliments to the Chief Inspr
of Mines in Mysore

By order

19/10 Sec to Govt

No. copy to Law Dept Dev Depts

NOTIFICATION.

No. D. 87—*Geol.* 100-27-15, *dated Camp Mysore, 27th October* 1928.

The following addition to Rule 52 of the Mysore Explosives Rules the draft of which was notified in No. D. 3406—Geol. 100-27-14, dated 19th September 1928, is sanctioned and published for general information :—

Add the following as a proviso to Rule 52 of the Mysore Explosives Rules :—

"Provided that if the fee levied under these rules is lower than that leviable under the Mysore Arms Rules, the difference shall be recovered before such an order is endorsed on the license."

By Order,
N. RAMA RAO,
Secretary to Government,
Developme.. Departments.